

As agreed in the personal interview, none of the applied art discloses "providing a runtime support to ensure that data is atomically processed per event without being interrupted," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 11 and 12.

The Office Action acknowledges on page 2 that Prithviraj does not teach this feature. The Office Action asserts that Culbert makes up for this deficiency. The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Culbert within the system of Prithviraj by processing events without being interrupted within the method for operating a Web-based management system because this allows critical data or higher "priority" data to be processed before other "priority" data as taught by Culbert (see col. 5, lines 33-36). This assertion is respectfully traversed.

The claimed runtime support processes the event atomically. In other words, the claimed runtime support can not process another event until that event is processed and the Web object changes from one state to a second (page 7, lines 17-34).

In contrast, Culbert determines whether an event is to be processed without interruption when it determines the event is a high priority process, or a process which has priority over processes. Further, the critical data or high-priority data is processed before other low-end priority. Thus, as agreed in the personal interview, the system of Culbert is different from the claimed runtime support as it does not atomically process per event without being interrupted, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 11 and 21.

Claims 1, 11 and 21 are not rendered obvious by Prithviraj in combination with Culbert. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, and claims 22-25 depend from claim 21, and thus would not be rendered obvious by Prithviraj in view of Culbert and further in view of Mitchell for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to

claims 1, 11 and 21. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/eks

Date: November 26, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p> |
|--|